

F I L E D

Clerk of the Superior Court

JUN 02 2006

By: K SANDOVAL, Deputy

FILING ID

11402537

Bruno W. Katz (SBN 174876)
SHEA, STOKES & CARTER ALC
510 Market Street, Third Floor
San Diego, California 92101
Telephone: (619) 232-4261
Facsimile: (619) 232-4840

Joel B. Kleinman
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY
2101 L Street N.W.
Washington DC 20037
Telephone: (202) 785-9700
Facsimile: (202) 887-0689

Attorneys for Defendants
Duke Energy Corporation, Duke Energy Field Services, LP,
and Duke Energy North America, LLC

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

Coordination Proceeding Special Title
(Rule 1550(b)):

NATURAL GAS CASES I, II, III, AND IV

[Document Relates to Price Misreporting Cases
Only]

JCCP No. 4221-00000

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DIRECTING
SOCALGAS AND SDG&E TO PROVIDE
RESPONSES TO CLASS DEFENDANTS'
DISCOVERY**

Department: 71
Coordination Trial Judge:
Hon. Ronald S. Prager

Date of Filing of Complaint: March 9, 2005

1 **[PROPOSED] ORDER**

2 On April 4, 2006, this Court granted the Motion of Class Defendant CMS Energy Resources
3 Management Co. to Compel Third Party Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to Provide Responses to
4 Subpoena. A copy of the Court's April 4, 2006 Order is attached hereto.

5 The Class Defendants served identical discovery requests on San Diego Gas & Electric Co.
6 ("SDG&E") and Southern California Gas Co. ("SoCalGas") and this Court finds Class Defendants
7 should have an opportunity to conduct reasonable discovery on certain limited issues from SDG&E
8 and SoCalGas.

9 ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that SDG&E and SoCalGas shall produce
10 reasonable responses to Class Defendants' discovery requests on an "Attorneys' Eyes Only" basis
11 under the November 15, 2005 protective order within 20 days of this ruling.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13
14 DATED: JUN 02 2006, 2006



Hon. Ronald S. Prager
Judge of the Superior Court

15
16
17 Respectfully submitted,

18
19 DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY

20 By: /s/ Joel B. Kleinman
21 Joel B. Kleinman

22 Attorneys for Defendants Duke Energy
23 Corporation, Duke Energy Field Services, LP,
and Duke Energy North America, LLC

24 10935972_1.DOC

FILING ID
#11402537

F I L E D
Clerk of the Superior Court

MAY 30 2006

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

County of San Diego

By: V. FERRERAS, Deputy

DATE: April 4, 2006 DEPT. 71 REPORTER A: CSR# 3184
PRESENT HON. RONALD S. PRAGER REPORTER B: CSR#
JUDGE

CLERK: K. Sandoval

BAILIFF: REPORTER'S ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 120128
SAN DIEGO, CA 92112-4104

JUDICIAL COUNSEL
COORDINATION PROCEEDINGS
NO. JCCP 4221
1,11,111, AND 1V

TITLE [Rule 1550(b)]
NATURAL GAS CASES

INDEXING

FINAL RULING

DEFENDANT CMS TO COMPEL PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC RESPONSES

This matter was taken under submission on April 3, 2006. The Court has reviewed the briefs, the arguments of counsel and the applicable law. The Tentative Ruling dated March 31, 2006 is affirmed. The Court hereby rules as follows.

The Motion of Class Defendant CMS Energy Resources Management Co. (CMS) to Compel Third Party Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) to provide responses to subpoena is GRANTED.

The parties do not dispute the fact that the requested discovery is relevant.

PG&E primarily objects to the production of the discovery on two grounds (1) privacy of its customers; and (2) its inability to produce the information pursuant to regulations or authority imposed by the CPUC. The Court finds neither issue allow the Court to deny CMS access to the requested information.

Defendants must have an opportunity to conduct discovery on class action issues before

they must file opposition to a motion to certify the class. (*Carabini v. Superior Court* (1994) 26 Cal.App.4th 239, 244) Here, the non-core class members represent consumers of large amounts of natural gas. These entities are primarily large corporations. As corporations and not private citizens, the corporations do not have an absolute right to privacy protections under the state and federal Constitution. (*Ameri-Medical Corp. v. Workers' Compensation Appeals Bd.* (1996) 42 Cal.App.4th 1260, 1287) The right to privacy of the corporations depends on the circumstances of the case. (*Ibid.*)

Here as named plaintiffs of a class action, the named non-core class members, have put their identities, acquisition, sales and consumption of natural gas at issue. (*Steiny and Cov. V. California Electric Supply Co.* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 285; *Vinson v. Superior Court of Alameda County* (1987) 43 Cal.3d 833) The information sought is narrowly tailored to the allegations of the complaint, and therefore, CMS is entitled to this discovery. The Court agrees that to the extent that the requested information is sensitive to the non-core class members the information discovered is protected by the confidentiality agreement executed in this action.

PG&E also asserts it is prohibited from disclosing the information because CPUC prohibits the dissemination of the customer information. However, the decisions relied upon by PG&E do not prohibit PG&E from disclosing customer information in every instance. (Hollis-Ross Declaration, Exs. A-B) PG&E may have an internal policy that customer information is absolutely confidential, but even that policy does not preclude the Court from ordering PG&E to produce the information. In any event, both the CPUC and PG&E's internal policy allow for production of customer information pursuant to legal process. Since PG&E was served with a valid subpoena, it may not rely on its own policy to prevent disclosure.

To the extent that PG&E claims the production of information is unduly burdensome, the Court finds PG&E has failed to sustain its burden that this is true.

Finally, although CMS seems to dispute the fact that it intends to subpoena further information from the absent non-core class members, any troublesome subpoenas served on the absent class members may be met with requests for protective orders from Plaintiffs' class counsel.

Thus, the Court grants CMS's motion to compel discovery and orders PG&E to produce the requested information, without further objection, within 10 days of this ruling.

11402537

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
Robert E. Cooper, SBN 035888
Richard P. Levy, SBN 053980
Mark E. Weber, SBN 120386
Kay E. Kochenderfer, SBN 125847
James P. Fogelman, SBN 161584
333 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90071-3197
Telephone: (213) 229-7000
Facsimile: (213) 229-7520

F I L E D
Clark of the Superior Court

MAY 30 2006

By: V. FERRERAS, Deputy

Attorneys for Defendants
SEMPRA ENERGY, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS
COMPANY, and SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC
COMPANY

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

COORDINATION PROCEEDING
SPECIAL TITLE (Rule 1550(b))

Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding
Nos. 4221, 4224, 4226 and 4228

NATURAL GAS ANTITRUST CASES I,
II, III AND IV

PROOF OF SERVICE

This Document Relates to:

ALL PRICE INDEXING CASES

1 I, Eugenia Varela, hereby certify as follows:

2 I am a resident of the State of California, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the
3 this action; my business address is 333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90071, in said
4 County and State; I am employed in the office of James P. Fogelman, a member of the bar of this
5 Court, and at his direction, on May 30, 2006, I instructed CourtLink to serve and file the foregoing
6 document(s) described as:

7 **[PROPOSED] ORDER DIRECTING SOCALGAS AND SDG&E TO PROVIDE**
8 **RESPONSES TO CLASS DEFENDANTS' DISCOVERY**

9 on all interested parties in this action.

10 ☒ **BY COURTLINK:** CourtLink caused such document(s) to be e-mailed, or delivered by mail
11 to the addresses listed with the Court.

12 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is
13 true and correct.

14 Executed on May 30, 2006, at Los Angeles, California.

15 _____
16 /s/ Eugenia Varela
Eugenia Varela

17 proof
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28